



A New Corpus of Aramaic Texts of the Achaemenid Period from Egypt

Author(s): Jonas C. Greenfield

Source: *Journal of the American Oriental Society*, Vol. 96, No. 1 (Jan. - Mar., 1976), pp. 131-135

Published by: [American Oriental Society](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/599902>

Accessed: 13/12/2010 14:19

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=aos>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Oriental Society is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of the American Oriental Society*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

"Formerly, Hu Hsin-yün^{bt} obtained a tracing and published it in his *Lin-lang pi-shih* saying that he had compared it with the *Kuang-chi* and only the three sections 'Tou Yü ch'i,' 'Hsin Kung-p'ing shang-hsien,' and 'Liang Ko' do not appear in the *Kuang-chi*. Of those quoted in the *Kuang-chi* but which do not appear in this book he copied out twenty sections²⁷ and edited 'col-

lected omissions' in two *chüan*. Now taking the *Kuang-chi* and again examining it, 'Tou Yü ch'i' appears at *Kuang-chi* 343 and 'Liang Ko' at *Kuang-chi* 219; only the one entry 'Hsin Kung-p'ing shang-hsien' does not appear. Furthermore, in *Chi-shih lei-ou*^{ca} I have obtained the entry 'Ch'ung-nu shih-tso'."^{cb}

Thus we can see that the HHKL, a work by an obscure author, was originally probably longer and organized somewhat differently than it is today. In S. Sung times a condensed four *chüan* edition was published. That is the oldest version we have today aside from the pieces which are included in various anthologies. There is sometimes confusion among the anthologists as to whether these anthology pieces belong to Li Fu-yen, Niu Seng-ju, or some other author. Finally, we can reasonably note that HHKL existed independently of the TPKC, for although the S. Sung edition of HHKL and the TPKC contain many of the same materials attributed to Li Fu-yen, they do not correspond completely.

ROBERT JOE CUTTER

UNIVERSITY OF WASHINGTON

²⁷ This should read "twelve" instead of "twenty." Of the twelve pieces gathered from TPKC by Hu, only "Ni Miao-chi" is undoubtedly by Li Fu-yen (see n. 4). But Wang Meng-ou (p. 13) feels that the Ming work *Ku-chin shuo-hai*,^{ba} compiled by Li Chi,^{bv} is mistaken when it attributes "Tu Tzu-ch'un"^{bw} to Cheng Huan-ku^{bx} of the T'ang. He believes that it is surely by Niu or Li and very likely by the latter; cf. E. D. Edwards, 2, pp. 54-55, 254 n. 1. Furthermore, on the basis of similarities in their language, he says that "P'ei Ch'en"^{by} and "Wei-shih tzu"^{bz} were both written by the same person, perhaps Li. See also Wang Meng-ou, pp. 6, 11-12.

A New Corpus of Aramaic Texts of the Achaemenid Period from Egypt*

The current state of studies in Aramaic letters and legal documents from Egypt and plans for a new corpus of these texts is outlined.

It is more than fifty years since A. E. Cowley assembled the Aramaic papyri then known in his *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford, 1923). In this volume he established a text and provided a translation and notes which have achieved virtually canonical status. Cowley did not include the ostraca and other Aramaic inscriptions from Egypt that had been published up to that time and limited himself solely to the papyri; he did include material from a later date. Although Cowley's work was very carefully done, and his knowledge of Aramaic and Hebrew was extensive, his work was in reality far from final and over the years scholars have differed with him as to the correctness of many of his readings and his interpretations. My recent examination of the papyri in the Berlin Museum has shown that Sachau's readings, corrected by Cowley and others, were often correct. Many of the suggestions made by the scholars who commented

on the original Sayce-Cowley and Sachau publications should also have been given fuller attention by Cowley. The translations offered by H. L. Ginsberg in *ANET* and by P. Grelot are enlightening from that point of view.¹ In the years following the publication of the Cowley volume Noel Aimé-Giron, the French scholar resident in Egypt, published a series of papyri, ostraca and other inscriptions that added greatly to the variety of texts available.² The Bauer-Meissner papyrus published in 1936 pushed our datable material in Aramaic from Egypt

¹ P. Grelot, *Documents arameens d'Égypte*, (Paris, 1972). Firsthand study of the papyri published in the Sayce-Cowley and Sachau volumes is impeded by the fact that many of them were returned to the Cairo museum where they have long since been misplaced. A useful listing of the published Aramaic texts of this period may be found in J. Naveh, *The Development of the Aramaic Script*, Jerusalem, 1970.

² The Bibliography in Bezalel Porten's *Archives from Elephantine* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1968) lists most of these. Since this book is readily available reference will be, whenever convenient, to Porten, Bibliography. For Aimé-Giron cf. p. 348.

* This is a slightly revised form of a paper read at the annual meeting of the American Oriental Society in Columbus, Ohio in April, 1975. To the usual abbreviations add *NESE: Neue Ephemeris für Semitische Epigraphik*, by R. Degen, W. W. Müller, W. Röllig (In Kommission bei Otto Harrassowitz, Wiesbaden, 1972 ff.).

back to the last quarter of the sixth century.³ A. Dupont-Sommer took over the publication of the Clermont-Ganneau ostraca collection and has continued to make these available at a slow pace.⁴ Other scholars have added to the corpus.⁵

In the last twenty-five years three major groups of texts were published: the *Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri* edited by E. G. Kraeling;⁶ the Arsham letters edited by G. R. Driver;⁷ and the Hermopolis letters edited by M. Kamil and E. Bresciani.⁸ The first group, coming from Elephantine, consisted of legal documents and fitted naturally with the previously known texts; the Arsham letters, although written in Babylon and Susa were sent to Egypt and reflect administrative language and practice and also epistolary style; the Hermopolis letters (from the late 6th century) present the familial and business affairs of an Aramean family. Additional papyri as well as other inscriptions have been published by Edda Bresciani and other scholars. An additional batch of papyri, these from Saqqarah, are to be published soon by J. B. Segal of the School of Oriental and African Studies, London.⁹

³ Porten, Bibliography p. 348. Note that the Sheikh-Fadl inscriptions thought by Aimé-Giron to be from the mid-seventh century are now conclusively dated by J. Naveh to the mid-fifth century. The oldest known Aramaic papyrus has been published by R. Degen in *NESE* 2 (1974), 67-70 but its provenance remains unknown.

⁴ Porten, Bibliography p. 349. Prof. Dupont-Sommer has informed me orally that due to exposure to the light over the years it is difficult to extract very much from the remaining unpublished ostraca.

⁵ Cf. J. B. Segal, *Iraq* 31 (1969), 173-74. A listing of the published ostraca is given by R. Degen, *NESE* 1 (1972), 34-5. J. Naveh had pointed out that all the ostraca were written by the same scribe. To Degen's list one should add A. Lozachmeur, *Semitica* 21 (1971), 81-93.

⁶ E. G. Kraeling, *The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri*, (New Haven, 1953).

⁷ G. R. Driver, *Aramaic Documents of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford, 1954); an abridged and revised edition appeared in 1957; a reprinting with additions and corrections in 1963. See now J. D. Whitehead, *Early Aramaic Epistolography: The Arsames Correspondence*, Ph.D. Diss., Univ. of Chicago, 1974.

⁸ E. Bresciani and M. Kamil, "Le lettere aramaiche di Hermopoli," *Atti della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Memorie, Classe di Scienze morali, storiche e filologiche* (Rome, 1966), Ser. VIII, 12/5, 356-428. The date was established in detail by J. Naveh, *IOS* 1 (1971) 120-22; cf. F. M. Cross, *AUSS* 7 (1969), 223-229.

⁹ For material published after the appearance of Por-

This increase in material has been accompanied by a renewal of interest in the varied subject matter. Since the majority of documents are of juridical nature interest in that aspect has been strong with important studies and articles by J. J. Rabinowitz, A. Verger, E. Volterra and R. Yaron. Philological studies by A. Bogulyubov, B. Couroyer, W. Eilers, J. A. Fitzmyer, H. L. Ginsberg, P. Grelot, the late E. Y. Kutscher and S. Segert have deepened our understanding of the Elephantine papyri. The Iranian component has been clarified by the articles of E. Benveniste, the late J. de Menasce, I. Gershevitch, W. B. Henning, M. Mayrhofer and others.¹⁰ R. Yaron has provided a juridical setting for the Elephantine Papyri in his *Introduction to the Law of the Aramaic Papyri* (Oxford, 1961) and Y. Muffs in his *Studies in the Aramaic Legal Papyri* (Leiden, 1969) has stressed the continuity of terminology and usage in the West-Semitic tradition. B. Porten has provided in his *Archives from Elephantine* the fullest picture of the "life of an ancient Jewish military colony." Finally, Naveh's important study of the paleography of early Aramaic (cf. note 1, above) has provided a sound basis for dating the texts.

I have stressed the recent publication of texts and studies to point up the need for a new integrated look at all the texts from Egypt. But a reexamination of the published texts themselves and the commentaries on them would underscore this. My reexamination of the Sachau papyri demonstrated this to me; Porten's even closer study of the originals of the *BMAP* and the subsequent publication of some of the results of his examination should make this apparent.¹¹ Kraeling's work was good

ten's Bibliography cf. J. Teixidor's "Bulletin d'épigraphie sémitique" which appears annually in *Syria*. The recently published P. Berol. 23 000 already has quite a bibliography: Z. Shunnar in Altheim-Stiehl, *Geschichte Mittelasiens im Altertum*, (Berlin, 1970), 111-17; J. Naveh—S. Shaked, *JAOS* 91 (1971), 379-82; R. Degen, *NESE* 1 (1972), 9-22; R. Macuch, *JAOS* 93, (1973) 58-60; Z. Shunnar in *Christentum am Roten Meer* 2 (Berlin, 1973), 277-89. For papyri fragments from the "Ägyptische Museum" in West Berlin, cf. R. Degen, *NESE* 2 (1974) 71-78. A preliminary survey of the Aramaic papyri is given by J. B. Segal in the report on the *Saggara Papyri* in the *Proceedings of the XIV International Congress of Papyrologists* (London, 1975), 252-55.

¹⁰ For references cf. Porten, Bibliography and Teixidor, "Bulletin."

¹¹ B. Porten, "Fragmentary Aramaic Marriage Contracts," *Graz College Anniversary Volume* (Philadelphia, 1971), 246-61; "The Aramaic Marriage Contract of the Handmaiden Tamut" (Hebrew), *Bible and Jewish His-*

but it did not fully represent the state of knowledge in the early 1950's when the work was published, as the reviews which appeared soon after publication showed (especially those of Ginsberg and Kutscher). If this is true for a work published twenty years ago, how much more so for Cowley's translation and notes. The late G. R. Driver's editions of the Arsham papyri cannot be faulted as to text; but the notes, although they have become clearer in subsequent editions, still remain a maze for the unwary, and are encumbered by superfluous material. Although we are greatly indebted to Mme. Bresciani for seeing the Hermopolis letters to press, the *editio princeps* did not always provide an adequate tool for further work as the subsequent studies of Donner, Hoftijzer, Kutscher, Milik and B. Porten together with this writer have shown.¹²

Beside the publication of Aramaic texts from Egypt from the Achaemenid period we can now look both backward and forward in various fields for relevant material which will enhance our understanding of these texts. First of all our knowledge of Ancient Aramaic and Official Aramaic has grown considerably by the publication of texts from Syria, Turkey, Iraq and Iran.¹³ The numerous Aramaic ostraca of the Achaemenid period found at sites in Israel and Jordan, although laconic, are also pertinent. Various aspects of ancient Near Eastern law have been treated in detail in recent years—especially family law—and the increased insights will help understand the relevant Elephantine texts.¹⁴ The so-called peripheral areas of cuneiform law are now better known; texts from Mari, Terqa, Tell Rimah, 'Alalah and Ugarit (in both Akkadian and Ugaritic), to limit ourselves to the Amorite area and

the West have been published, while Neo-Assyrian texts from Nimrud and elsewhere have clarified terms and usages. Neo-Babylonian material ranging through the Arsacid period as studied by G. Cardascia, M. A. Dandamayev, H. Petschow and M. San Nicolo and others has provided important contemporary parallels.¹⁵ The increased number of Demotic texts now available, especially marriage contracts and land deeds, have provided important parallels especially for the schema of the Elephantine documents.¹⁶

It may be hoped that important corpora of Aramaic documents will be published in the near future and the continuity of this legal tradition may be adequately studied. I refer to the Dālyā papyri from the late fourth century to be published by F. M. Cross¹⁷ and the Bar Kosiba and Babatha archives in Aramaic, Nabatean, Hebrew and Greek from the Nahal Hever cave to be published by Y. Yadin.¹⁸ The Bar Kosiba texts from the Murubba'at caves and those from a so-called "unknown provenience" have already indicated the elements of continuity that may be expected.¹⁹ The Nabatean texts,

¹⁵ Cf. G. Cardascia, *Les archives des Murašû*, (Paris, 1951); M. A. Dandamayev, *Rabstvo v Vavilonii* (Slavery in Babylonia in the 7th-4th Centuries B.C.), Moscow, 1974; cf. also his works in English and German listed on p. 436 of that volume); H. Petschow, *Die Neubabylonischen Kaufformulare* (Leipzig, 1939) and *Neubabylonisches Pfandrecht* (Leipzig, 1956); M. San Nicolò-H. Petschow, *Babylonische Rechtsurkunden aus dem 6. Jahrhundert*, Munich, 1960. The period will be further enlightened by the texts and studies being prepared for publication by E. Leichty, M. W. Stolper and D. Weisberg.

¹⁶ Cf. Porten, Appendix VI, pp. 334-43.

¹⁷ For the present cf. F. M. Cross, "Papyri of the Fourth Century B.C. from Daliyeh," *New Directions in Biblical Archaeology*, ed. by D. N. Freedman and J. C. Greenfield (New York, 1969), pp. 45-69.

¹⁸ For the present cf. Y. Yadin, *IEJ* 12 (1962), 235-57 and the relevant chapters in his *Bar-Kokhba* (New York, 1971); for the Greek documents of the Babatha archive cf. H. J. Polotsky, *IEJ* 12 (1962), 258-62 and *Eretz Israel* 7 (1967), 46-51.

¹⁹ P. Benoit, J. T. Milik and R. de Vaux, *Les grottes de Murabba'at* (*DJD* II; Oxford 1961). J. T. Milik published two texts from "an unknown place" in the Judean desert which were actually from Nahal Hever. The first was published in *RB* 61 (1954), 182-90 and republished in *Biblica* 38 (1957), 264-68 taking into consideration the comments of H. L. Ginsberg, S. Abramson and others; the second was published on pp. 255-64 of that article; cf. too *Inscriptions Revealed* (Jerusalem, 1973) nos. 187-93 for improved readings and translations.

tory . . . dedicated to the Memory of Jacob Liver (Tel Aviv, 1971), 307-29.

¹² For Bibliography of the Hermopolis texts cf. B. Porten - J. C. Greenfield, "Hermopolis letter 6," *IOS* 4 (1974), 14-30.

¹³ The clay tablets in Aramaic from Assur and from Tell Halaf have most recently been restudied by E. Lipinski, *Studies in Aramaic Inscriptions and Onomastics I* (*Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta* 1, Leuven, 1975) 83-142. P. Bordreuil has published another legal document in *Semitica* 23 (1973), 95-102. E. Lipinski will publish tablets in the possession of the Musées Royaux du Cinquantenaire in Brussels. A. Caquot has published "Une inscription araméenne d'époque assyrienne" in *Homages à André Dupont-Sommer*, Paris, 1971, 9-16; this has been commented on by P.-E. Dion, *Biblica* 55 (1974), 399-403 and Lipinski, *op. cit.* 77-82.

¹⁴ Cf. the articles of J. J. Finkelstein, S. Greengus, W. W. Hallo and B. Landsberger to mention only scholars working in the United States.

one of which was partially published by J. Starcky, share in particular in the Aramaic background of the Elephantine legal documents.²⁰ There are still other documents that are pertinent but I would single out the Syriac slave sale contract from Dura Europos²¹ and the various contracts from the Cairo Geniza, especially the Palestinian type of *ketubba* being studied in detail by M. Friedman.²² They provide evidence for the continuity of certain phrases and practices as late as the eleventh century C.E.²³

The scholars named above, as well as others, have explained the Iranian words and expressions in both the Elephantine documents and the Arsham letters.²⁴ I cannot point to many relevant contemporary texts in the Iranian dialects for this period although Elamite and Aramaic texts from Persepolis contain pertinent information.²⁵ It is rather the advances that have been made

²⁰ Cf. *RB* 61 (1954), 161-81 and this writer's article (in Hebrew) "Studies in the Legal Terminology of the Nabatean Funerary Inscriptions," *H. Yalon Memorial Volume* (Jerusalem, 1974), 64-83.

²¹ Cf. J. Goldstein, *JNES* 25 (1966), 1-16; the Aramaic parchment from Dura (P. Dura 151) most recently studied by J. T. Milik, *Syria* 45 (1968), 97-104 may best be understood as a contract and interpreted in that light.

²² M. Friedman, "Termination of the Marriage upon the Wife's Request: A Palestinian *Ketubba* Stipulation," *PAAJR* 37 (1969), 29-55; "Master and Slave Girl," *Gratz College Annual of Jewish Studies* (Philadelphia) 1 (1972), 56-63; cf. too the articles of Gershon Weiss especially "Formularies Reconstructed from the Cairo Geniza," *ibid.* 2 (1973), 29-42; 3 (1974), 63-76.

²³ The late E. Y. Kutscher in his article "Concerning the Terminology of Legal Documents in the Talmud and in Gaonic Literature" (in Hebrew), *Tarbiz* 17 (1946), 125-127; 19 (1947/48), 53-59; 125-28 stressed the continuity from the Elephantine documents to those of later periods. With the additional material that has become available since the late forties this can be done in greater detail.

²⁴ The late W. B. Henning studied the title *hphptl'* in "Ein persischer Titel im Altaramäischen" in *In Memoriam Paul Kahle* (Berlin, 1968), 138-45. Martin Schwartz commented on 'drng' in *JAOS* 89 (1969), 154 and this writer studied *hmrkr'* in the *Henning Memorial Volume* (London, 1970), 180-86.

²⁵ Cf. G. G. Cameron, *Persepolis Treasury Tablets* (OIP LXV; Chicago, 1948) and R. T. Hallock, *Persepolis Fortification Tablets* (OIP XCII; Chicago, 1969) and the various articles by Cameron and Hallock. *The Aramaic Ritual Texts from Persepolis* published by R. A. Bowman (OIP XCI; Chicago, 1970) and the graffiti and other

in Iranian studies in general, and the better understanding of Parthian, Pahlavi and Sogdian texts that have provided important points of clarification. In particular one may point to the partial publication of the Nysa ostraca by Diakonoff and Livshitz;²⁶ the recent edition of the Sasanian law book by Anahit Perakhanian;²⁷ and the edition of the Sogdian documents from Mt. Mugh by various Soviet scholars.²⁸ These texts attest to the continuity of scribal tradition within the Iranian area. Inversely the roots of some elements of Iranian law may be found in the Elephantine texts as may be seen from the use of Iranian loanwords and legal formulae.

These then are some of the matters that a new corpus of Aramaic texts from Egypt would have to take into consideration, and which make the undertaking of such an enterprise imperative. I would like to note some other items that the commentary to the new corpus will deal with. The first is the relationship of the Elephantine legal material to its contemporary Israelite legal tradition. This has been neglected in most recent studies in favor of the Near Eastern background or a vague 'Aramaic' legal tradition. I believe that a good case can be made for the presence of clearly defined 'Israelite' legal in-

texts, as yet unpublished,[†] give us an insight into Aramaic as used in the 'capital.' M. Mayrhofer's *Onomastica Persepolitana* (Vienna, 1973) contains valuable material for the study of the Iranian names of the Elephantine papyri. M. A. Dandamayev's important study of the social and economic history of Iran *Iran pri pervikh Akhemenidakh* (Moscow, 1963) is now available as *Iran unter den frühen Achämeniden* (Darmstadt, 1974).

²⁶ I. M. Diakonoff and V. A. Livshitz *Dokumenty iz Nisy* (Moscow, 1960) and *Novy nakhodki dokumentov v staroy Nise in Peredneaziatsky sbornik* 2 (Moscow, 1966) 134-157. Cf. too the Parthian letter from Dura Europos (P. Dura 154) studied by W. B. Henning in *Dura Parchments and Papyri* ed. C. B. Welles (New Haven, 1959) 414-15.

²⁷ A. G. Perakhanian, *Sasanidskii Sudebnik* (Erevan, 1973). This is a translation of the *Mātakdān ī dātastān*. Cf. too D. N. Mackenzie and A. G. Perikhanian, "The Model marriage contract in Pahlavi" *K. R. Cama Oriental Institute Golden Jubilee Volume*, (Bombay 1969), 103-112.

²⁸ Three volumes of *Sogdskie Doumenty s Gory Mug* were published in Moscow in 1962. Vol. 1 by A. A. Freiman contains general remarks; the second by V. A. Livshitz contains 'juridical documents' and letters; the third by M. N. Bogulyubov and O. N. Smirnova contains economic texts. The first text in the second volume is the Sogdian marriage contract (already studied by Livshitz in *Sovietska Etnografia*, 1960, 76-91).

stitutions among the Jews of Elephantine.²⁹ The second is the importance of the Egyptian Aramaic texts for clarifying Biblical passages from a variety of periods. These texts give us concrete instances of the framework—legal, social and religious—in which certain terms and phrases were used and may well serve to clarify the Biblical usage.³⁰ They also provide valuable information about administrative procedure and the formal elements of documents, decrees and letters.³¹ The final item is linguistic—the publication of a corpus will enable the linguist to examine the various dialects of Aramaic in use in Egypt during this period, to describe the salient

²⁹ The late J. J. Rabinowitz in his book *Jewish Law: Its Influence on the Development of Legal Institutions* (New York, 1956) and in his articles noted relevant material. He exaggerated, however, the 'Jewish' element in the texts he dealt with. The works of Ginsberg, Kutschner, Muffs and Yaron and the earlier articles of J. N. Epstein contain much valuable material along these lines.

³⁰ A useful start in this direction may be found in E. Vogt, *Lexicon Linguae Aramaicae Veteris Testamenti Documentis Antiquis Illustratum* (Rome, 1971) which provides verbal parallels to the Biblical Aramaic material. However, some of the parallels are merely verbal; in very few cases is the interrelationship of these texts seen or is pertinent literature cited. The "Sayings of Ahiqar" although available in recent translations by H. L. Ginsberg and P. Grelot demands a modern study that will make use of developments in the study of Babylonian and Egyptian wisdom literature.

³¹ Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, "Some Notes on Aramaic Epistolography" *JBL* 93 (1974), 201-25.

morphological features of Official Aramaic and the other dialects in use there, and to engage in comprehensive lexicographical and syntactic studies.

A start, indeed a good start I believe, has been made in an initial publication by Bezalel Porten and this writer. In a monograph entitled: *Jews of Elephantine and Arameans of Syene: Fifty Aramaic Texts with Hebrew and English Translations*, Edited and newly translated by B. Porten in collaboration with J. C. Greenfield (Jerusalem, 1974) we present the result of our restudy of forty-two Elephantine documents and the eight Hermopolis letters.³² The Aramaic text is newly set and is the product of our reexamining the originals or new photographs or the close study of the plates whenever that was the only possibility open to us. We have also provided a new translation in both Hebrew and English and basic bibliographical references. Since the *Corpus* will be in the works for some years to come the writers have deemed it necessary to publish some parts in advance of the whole work. Thus a series of articles dealing with the Hermopolis letters have already appeared, and these letters, as a unit, are almost ready for publication.

In informing the scholarly world of this planned corpus, our purpose is not to stake out a field for ourselves, as much as to prevent unneeded duplication of effort. We welcome cooperation, advice and support.

JONAS C. GREENFIELD

HEBREW UNIVERSITY, JERUSALEM

³² Published by Akademon, the Student book-store of the Hebrew University in the series "Texts and Studies for Students of the Department of the History of the Jewish People."

'ypr' hwrmyz Mother of King Shapur and 'pr' hwrmyz Mother of Khusro A Note on the Name 'ypr' / 'pr' hwrmyz

The name 'ypr' hwrmyz, hitherto known only from talmudic sources, also appears in a Mandaic incantation text in the form 'pr' hwrmyz. The new evidence tends to confirm the Iranian provenance of the first, as well as the second, element of the name.

The Babylonian Talmud transmits five stories about "ypr' hwrmyz mother of King Shapur."¹ The historical value of these stories has been discussed, definitively I

believe, by Jacob Neusner.² My remarks here are limited to the name of the "queen mother."

¹ Babylonian Talmud Ta'anit 24b, Bava Batra 8a-b, 10b-11a, Zevahim 116a, and Niddah 20b. From the dates of the masters mentioned in these stories it is evident that the Shapur referred to is Shapur II.

² Jacob Neusner, *History of the Jews in Babylonia*, Vol. 4 (Leiden, 1969), pp. 35-39, and *idem*, "Babylonian Jewry and Shapur II's Persecution of Christianity from 339-379 A.D.," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 43 (1972), 93-95. Contrast G. Widengren, "The Status of the Jews